- 1		
1	SHANNON LISS-RIORDAN (SBN 310719) (sliss@llrlaw.com) THOMAS FOWLER (pro hac vice forthcoming) (tfowler@llrlaw.com) LICHTEN & LISS-RIORDAN, P.C. 729 Boylston Street, Suite 2000 Boston, MA 02116	
2		
3		
4		
5		
6	Telephone: (617) 994-5800 Facsimile: (617) 994-5801	
7	Attomony for Plaintiffa Canaling Domost Stuiffin	
8	Attorneys for Plaintiffs Carolina Bernal Strifling and Willow Wren Turkal, on behalf of themselves	
9	and all others similarly situated	
		DICEDICE COLUM
10 11	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA OAKLAND DIVISION	
12		
13		Case No. 4:22-cv-07739-JST
14	CAROLINA BERNAL STRIFLING and	Case 110. 4.22-CV-07739-JS1
	WILLOW WREN TURKAL, on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated,	DI ADMINERA NOMICE OF DECEMBE OF
15		PLAINTIFFS' NOTICE OF RECEIPT OF NOTICES OF RIGHT TO SUE
16	Plaintiffs,	
17	V.	
18	TWITTER, INC.	
19	Defendant	
20	Detendant	
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

PLAINTIFFS' NOTICE OF RECEIPT OF NOTICE OF RIGHT TO SUE

In Twitter's Motion to Dismiss (Dkt. 20), it argued that Plaintiffs' sex discrimination claims under Title VII, 42 U.S.C. § 2000e, *et seq.* (Count I), and the California Fair Employment and Housing Act, Gov. Code § 12900 *et seq.* (Count II), should be dismissed because they had not yet received notices of right to sue from the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission ("EEOC") and the California Department of Fair Employment & Housing ("DFEH"). The EEOC and DFEH have now issued notices of right to sue, as of February 22, 2023, attached as Exhibits A-D. Plaintiffs maintain that the administrative exhaustion requirement should be excused in light of the exigent circumstances of this case, given that they had reason to believe that Twitter would seek full releases of claims from the putative class members in this matter, and thus Plaintiffs needed to quickly move for a protective order. See Plaintiffs' Opposition to Twitter's Motion to Dismiss at 8-12 (Dkt. 27). In any event, now that the notice of right to sue has been issued, this issue is a moot point, and the case may now proceed. See Oliphant v. City and County of San Francisco, 2010 WL 1875711, at *9 (N.D. Cal. May 7, 2010) (citing Wrighten v. Metropolitan Hospitals, Inc., 726 F.2d 1346, 1351 (9th Cir. 1984)).

Respectfully submitted,

CAROLINA BERNAL STRIFLING and WILLOW WREN TURKAL, on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated,

By their attorneys,

/s/ Shannon Liss-Riordan
Shannon Liss-Riordan, SBN 310719
Thomas Fowler (*pro hac vice* forthcoming)
LICHTEN & LISS-RIORDAN, P.C.
729 Boylston Street, Suite 2000
Boston, MA 02116
(617) 994-5800

Email: sliss@llrlaw.com; tfowler@llrlaw.com

Dated: March 3, 2023

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Shannon Liss-Riordan, hereby certify that a true and accurate copy of this document was served on counsel for Defendant Twitter, Inc. via the CM/ECF system on March 3, 2023.

/s/ Shannon Liss-Riordan Shannon Liss-Riordan